

can come only as a result of thorough, penetrating onsite inspection by reliable observers. The current intelligence estimate that they are not present is based largely on the negative evidence that there is no affirmative proof to the contrary. This, of course, was precisely the status of the matter prior to last October 14.

There is no doubt that there are literally thousands of caves and caverns in Cuba and that it is feasible to use many of these for the storage and concealment of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons. It is also true that military activity has been observed in connection with these caves.

The basis that is usually given for the claim that the United States scored a victory is the withdrawal of Soviet missiles but we are not sure that they are all withdrawn or that others have not been introduced since last October. Aerial surveillance of the island is clearly not enough to tell us that there are no missiles in Cuba.

The Soviet Union insists that it received from the administration a promise that this country would not invade Cuba nor would it permit an invasion from other Latin American countries. Administration officials have indicated that they do not concur in this conclusion but in the published correspondence between the President and Khrushchev there is no statement by President Kennedy that Khrushchev's interpretation of their understanding is wrong. A large part of public opinion of the world believes that the United States made the commitment that Khrushchev maintains was made. President Kennedy has not effectively dispelled the doubt that exists on this point. This is at least a propaganda victory for the Soviet Union.

Early in 1963 the United States withdrew its missiles from Turkey and Italy, giving credence to the belief that Khrushchev had forced this concession from President Kennedy. A responsible semi-official French military publication has flatly charged that the withdrawal of these missiles was part of a bargain struck by the President of the United States and the leader of the U.S.S.R. Here again was a victory for the Soviet Union.

The Federal Government cracked down on raids against Cuba and against shipping destined for Cuba by exiles. This was an action which Fidel Castro had listed as one of his five demands on the United States on October 28, 1962.

Shortly thereafter, Dr. Miro Cardona, leader of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, broke with the Kennedy administration alleging that the administration had been guilty of bad faith—that it had promised United States support of another invasion of Cuba and had gone back on its word.

Castro continues a campaign of terrorism and subversion from one end of Latin America to the other. He invades British Islands 30 miles from Florida with impunity to kidnap Cuban exiles, in spite of the repeated promises of President Kennedy that Cuba would not be permitted to export its revolution.

In January of this year the Committee on Security of the OAS declared "it is no exaggeration to say that Cuba has now been converted into a Soviet mili-

tary camp." The Committee further said that "the Cuban regime has begun a new phase of promoting and encouraging violent subversion in other countries of the hemisphere." This statement was signed by the American Ambassador to the OAS, the representative of President Kennedy.

As I survey the panorama of events at the time of the missile crisis and after, I cannot see victory of any kind for the United States. The administration backed down from its announced objective. Castro is still on the loose throughout Latin America. Soviet power remains strongly entrenched in Cuba. This is not victory as Americans have understood the word.

Yes, as we stood eyeball to eyeball the Soviets did blink but at that moment they saw a great weakness. We forced Russia to take one step backward and then allowed her to take three forward. In fact we still have not blinked but rather seem to be in a fixed position as if in a trance. We won the battle of the day but we are losing the war that has followed. Our friends in all of Latin America are being subverted by communism and as a result they are forced to suspect the good intentions of the United States. We stand unblinking to be sure, fixed and sinking in the sea of executive confusion on what our hopes are for the achievements of the people of Central and South America.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman on his statement marking the anniversary of the President's Cuban statement.

THE WORLD TODAY

Mr. Speaker, just 1 year ago this country was in the midst of the Cuban missile crisis. The mood of the country was one of determination, anxiety, resolve, and outrage. We were determined and resolved to get those Russian missiles and troops out of Cuba. We were anxious about the consequences of our actions but we went ahead because we had to. We were outraged at the deceit and duplicity of the Russians who had time and again assured us that only defensive weapons had gone into Cuba.

Today, just 1 year later, we have already signed and ratified a test ban treaty; we are ready to sell wheat to Russia and some of her satellites; and our President has invited the Soviets to join us in a cooperative moon venture. In selling wheat to the Russians at a subsidized price—U.S. taxpayers contribute 60 cents a bushel—momentarily we help our farm surplus problem. This sale undeniably strengthens the Communists where they are weak. We evidently have waited 17 years for a weak spot in order to dash in to fill it by cash sales. We seem to overlook the additional bargaining position our agricultural abundance could secure for freedom and peace in our world today.

It is particularly necessary to take stock of the world situation because our attitudes of 1 year ago have changed so drastically. What, for example, has

happened in the intervening 12 months that has convinced us of a new sincerity on the part of the Communists?

In Cuba, Russian military weapons and troops still remain. Castro continues to carry on a highly stepped-up infiltration campaign into the Latin American countries. In British Guiana, Cheddi Jagan is an avowed Marxist-Leninist. In Venezuela and Brazil, Communist activity is assuming alarming proportions. In all of Latin America, Castro-trained and Russian-financed agitators are stirring up trouble.

In southeast Asia, the Communists continue their relentless drive to take over that entire area. Every day in Laos, they violate the Geneva agreements. Over half of the most strategic part of that country is under the firm control of the Communist Pathet Lao.

In South Vietnam, the prospects of a free world victory are still very remote because the Communist Vietcong can retreat to the privileged sanctuary of Communist North Vietnam with impunity. Russian weapons are being used every day against our American troops.

In Europe, the Berlin wall still stands, a monument to the true character of international communism. In the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa, the Communist grand design continues to be carried out relentlessly. These are some of the problems that were with us last October and still remain.

Mr. Speaker, there are other, very far-reaching problems that we must also consider regarding free world policies and the effect some of our recent proposals will have on them. The NATO alliance, for example, must be strengthened, not weakened. Yet, the more we convince ourselves that true cooperation is possible with the Communists, the less we will believe in the need for greater deterrent strength. If we are right in believing in the Communists' new found sincerity, then nothing is lost. If we are wrong, however, everything could be lost. This in itself is ample reason to go slow in pursuing a policy of all-out cooperation with the Communists. We should at least demand some concrete demonstrations on the part of the Communists such as the dismantling of the Berlin wall or the removal of troops and weapons from Cuba before we continue to collaborate with them in other areas.

More than at any other time in the cold war, this particular period of apparent eased tensions is the time to proceed cautiously and slowly lest we do in haste what we will one day regret more bitterly than anything else we have done thus far.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his contribution.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has been pursuing a policy of coexistence with Cuba through accommodations since the missiles were

supposedly removed last year. I think on the occasion of this anniversary, which is not one of which the American people can be proud as it relates to what has happened since then, it would be well to review for a few moments just exactly how many accommodations have been made to Fidel Castro's Communist Cuba, and the extent to which accommodations have been sought and have been acquiesced in by this country.

Mr. Speaker, this year of indecision, vacillation and accommodation leads me to the conclusion that the New Frontier lacks both the will and the determination necessary to win the cold war struggle against communism in this hemisphere. Events following the crisis started with the scrapping of the Monroe Doctrine. As the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] mentioned, failure to insist upon, at a time when we had the position of strength from which we could have been successful, onsite inspection followed by other events, have substantiated my worst fears. The Soviet missiles were withdrawn, if they were withdrawn, at the expense, apparently from the development subsequently, of de facto recognition of Castro's island as a permanent Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

That hands off Cuba was the quid pro quo Khrushchev demanded for withdrawing his missiles is evidenced by the New Frontier actions since the crisis.

Ever since the missile crisis, this administration has used every force at its command to restrain Cuban exiles from winning back their freedom. They have halted exile raids, seized their weapons, disbanded effective anti-Communist exile groups, and arrested men who were bent on destroying Cuba's economy by flooding it with bogus Cuban money, and just the day before yesterday, according to press reports, some 22 exiles were stopped in three boats from going to Cuba in attempting to win back their freedom.

I would like to call attention to the fact that on October 28 at the very time this missile crisis was at its height, Fidel Castro made five demands on the United States. One of those was that all exile raids from the United States and Puerto Rico be stopped. That demand is being met.

The New Frontier has stood idly by while fleeing Cubans have been captured by Castro's warships, and it has withdrawn support of anti-Communist Cuban espionage agents in Latin America and in Cuba. The New Frontier has refused to take effective steps to halt the flow of free world ships carrying goods, including strategic materials, to Cuba, has refused to close the Panama Canal to ships carrying such goods to Cuba, and has violated the laws and clear intent of Congress in failing to advise Congress why it continues to send U.S. foreign aid money to nations trading with Cuba.

Of course, the House of Representatives does not have a much better record in that they did not vote favorably on the amendment offered first by the gentleman from Montana and secondly the amendment by myself that would have mandatorily cut off such aid which could

have been brought about by my amendment to the foreign aid bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to point out to the gentleman, if he will recall, that the Battin amendment actually had in it a waiver clause. I understand that is what the gentleman is referring to. As I recall, the gentleman spoke in favor of that amendment which had the waiver provision in it, and then voted for the provision. Later on the gentleman presented an amendment which the House did not accept. I want to keep the record straight.

Mr. CRAMER. I will be delighted to straighten the record out.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think the record is straight if the gentleman will refer to it.

Mr. CRAMER. I proposed on the House floor and was in support of an even stronger amendment with no discretion left in the President, as the gentleman knows, requiring the withholding of funds, foreign aid funds, to any nation that did business with Fidel Castro. The gentleman knows that has been my position from the outset. The gentleman from Florida along with the other gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], having been the ones who proposed the Democratic version, which was a watered down, Milquetoast version, which left in the President the same discretion he has had, in effect, and which has resulted in the very thing the gentleman has day after day taken the floor of the House and complained about, and rightly so. That is that over 50 percent of the ship bottoms carrying goods to Cuba still are free nation bottoms and there is no intention, will or desire on the part of the New Frontier to stop it so long as it retains discretion under the law to permit such shipping. The only way it could have been stopped was to adopt the Cramer amendment which would have made it mandatory that all such funds be withheld. I think it is unfortunate, and particularly that the gentleman from Florida, who has day after day taken the floor and complained about free world shipping continuing to go to Cuba, did not see fit to support my amendment which would have done the job.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] states he offered amendment to a watered-down version of the Fassel-Rogers amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. That is precisely correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Which actually had no waiver provision in it, and if the gentleman from Florida will recall he did not offer his amendment to the Battin amendment which he supported and which had a specific provision for waiver in it.

Mr. CRAMER. The record is very clear, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Exactly.

Mr. BATTIN. I would say to the gentleman that I offered a substitute for the

Fassel amendment, which dealt only with shipping. My amendment provided for both shipping and aircraft, and it provided that a waiver was not available to the President except for humanitarian reasons and emergencies at sea. It was voted down.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman knows full well that the amendment he and Mr. FASCELL offered did not cure the presently existing discretion to waive which was left in the law by the Fassel-Rogers amendment any time the President wanted to permit friendly nations to continue to ship to Cuba and still get our aid. It was the purpose of my amendment to remove the waiver provisions making it mandatory to withhold aid to nations trading with Cuba. The gentleman knows full well that is what the amendment would have done. If the gentleman had voted for it it would have passed, because it ended up a tie, 162 to 162, with the chairman having to vote against it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. There is a general waiver provision in the foreign aid bill. The President could waive the provisions of the law only when it was in the interest of the national security of the United States. The House in its wisdom felt it was wise for the President to have this opportunity to waive it whenever the security of the United States was involved. For instance, if Nicaragua or some country were allowing its ships or its planes to carry goods to the exiles in Cuba who were trying to fight the Castro regime, the President could waive this provision and say that those countries could still be allowed aid if it was in the interest of the national security of the United States.

Mr. CRAMER. Those are the very actions the President is cutting off today by not even permitting the exiles from this country to try to win back the freedom of their country while at the same time he is permitting friendly nations to receive aid and still trade with Cuba.

I say to the gentleman that the President is permitting these goods to continue to go to Cuba in free-world bottoms. The only way to stop it, and the gentleman knows the only way to stop it, would be to adopt the Cramer amendment, with no discretion to permit those goods to continue to go to Cuba. Any country desiring to aid the exiles outside the United States would not be affected by my amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Since the last statement of the gentleman is not so, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATTIN. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that I would like the other gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] to finish. I have other requests for time.

Mr. CRAMER. Further, with regard to the New Frontier attitude toward Cuba in the last year, it allows Cuban planes—and I think it is well to review this record at this time—it allows Cuban planes to overfly the United States on a Canada-Havana route, so long as they stop for inspection. It allows Castro to select the exiles that came to America on the returning ransom ships—50 per-

cent of them having been selected by Fidel Castro himself. And, it turned around and ran instead of pursuing those Cuban airplanes that took potshots at American fishing vessels. This is the record.

It has entered into a wheat deal with Russia, the final results of which will most probably see American wheat in some form ending up in Cuba.

It has failed miserably to come up with any plan to rid communism from Cuba and from this hemisphere and, thus, put vitality into the Monroe Doctrine.

One year after the so-called missile crisis, Castro is in a stronger position than before the crisis. This administration has acceded to Castro's demand that we hold back Cuban exiles working for his overthrow and this gives the Communists a permanent military establishment 90 miles from our shores in a hemisphere formerly free from communism. To add insult to injury, we have acceded to some of Castro's demands without even getting on-site inspection.

Subsequent to the missile crisis, the United States withdrew its missiles from Italy and Turkey and has reduced the number of long-range nuclear bombers in Europe. In the light of these and other circumstances, I must look upon the anniversary of the missile crisis as a day of mourning over our continuing failure to oust Castro; and sincerely believe the President should, instead of issuing gold engraved calendars to commemorate this armed foothold for communism in this hemisphere, issue black arm bands to remind us of our failures and of the demise of the Monroe Doctrine.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. SHRIVER (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Communist domination and occupation of Cuba today remain as serious a problem to the security and freedom of the United States and other Western Hemisphere governments as 1 year ago.

The presence of Soviet military forces and/or technicians in Cuba, growing operations of Russian fishing trawlers and other vessels between North Atlantic fishing banks and Cuba, and the instability of many Latin American governments point up the problem which just has not gone away with last year's confrontation with the Soviet Government over Russian offensive missiles.

On this anniversary date it is important that the administration, the Congress, and the American people be reminded that the problem which we faced so determinedly a year ago remains the same—only the tension is lessened.

The Soviets are in Cuba primarily for the purpose of increasing and spreading communism's influence and power in Latin America and they are exploiting their foothold to the greatest extent possible.

Earlier this year, we were reminded in an interim report issued by the Pre-

paredness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services in the U.S. Senate:

The paramount danger * * * is that the nations of this hemisphere may be subverted one by one and be exploited, in turn, for subversive and revolutionary activities. By this process of erosion our neighbors to the South may fall nation by nation until the entire hemisphere is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

Mr. Speaker, since the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961, six Latin American governments have fallen. Others are in danger of falling. This instability within these Latin American governments provides great opportunities for infiltration by Castroites and the eventual achievement of Communist objectives.

The people of the Western Hemisphere look to the United States to provide the leadership in the development of a policy and program which will soon lead to the removal of Soviet military forces and the elimination of the Communist regime in Cuba.

It is essential that neither the administration nor the Congress forget the Cuban people who have been promised time and again that the flag of freedom will again fly on that oppressed island. The entire Cuban problem should be given the highest possible priority by the U.S. Government to the end that the evil threat which hangs over this hemisphere will be eliminated at an early date.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, let me quote the following:

The cost of freedom is always high—but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose is the path of surrender or submission.

These are fine words expressing a noble concept. They come not from any one of the so-called extremist groups of the country, but rather from President Kennedy in his remarks of a year ago today on the Cuba crisis.

Mr. Kennedy also in that notable address of October 22, 1962, called our attention to what he called the clear lesson of the 1930's. He said aggressive conduct, if allowed to grow unchecked and unchallenged, ultimately leads to war. I want to suggest that this is the same lesson taught us not only in the 1930's, but throughout the 1940's, 1950's, and right down to the present moment in history. It is a lesson which we as Americans have been all too slow to learn, and there is considerable doubt as to whether we have yet learned it.

One of the questions, for example, that all Americans might ask now is whether our current situation with relation to Cuba amounts to the kind of submission President Kennedy spoke of a year ago today. We should recall that in 1961 Mr. Kennedy assured us that we would not tolerate communism in Cuba for long.

Now, in 1963, are we being asked to tolerate communism in Cuba after all? And are we being asked to believe that we have won a notable victory in the re-

ported departure of Russian missiles and military personnel from Cuba?

I believe it is incumbent on all of us to recall that we have never received full assurance that the Russian military presence in Cuba does not continue. In fact, when Mr. Sterling Cottrell, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America testified on August 13 to a House Appropriations Subcommittee, he said the Russians in Cuba were only "thinning out" and that they are giving extensive training to Cubans in the use of military equipment such as surface-to-air missiles and Mig-21's. And we also need to remind ourselves of the export of subversives and subversive equipment from Cuba to other Latin American countries where the cumulative effects of Communist subversion are becoming more serious every day.

And even if we were to assume that we have reverted to the conditions existing in the summer of 1962, is this a victory? Has the Kennedy administration managed already to make Americans believe that a Communist Cuba is a satisfactory situation after the assurances given us only 2 years ago?

In Latin America today the essential ingredient for long-term progress is economic and social stability. It is U.S. policy, or nonpolicy, which is one of the major contributors to the lack of stability. It is the paralysis of will which somehow has deprived us of the ability to take action where needed in defense of freedom. It is the administration's obvious lack of intent to support its articulate words which gives us the biggest problem in the world today. It is not military takeovers which we need to fear the most. We need to avoid continued instability of the kind which fosters other Cubas. We need to support stability, not only in eloquent praise of idealistic goals, but in solid action which will give notice to Latin America that we intend to support what we used to call the "legitimate aspirations" of free people everywhere for peace, progress, and freedom.

The lesson of the 1930's and also the lesson of October 22, 1962, is that when we take the proper kind of action, and not just talk about action, our allies will support us. The Organization of American States was only lukewarm in support of U.S. speeches about Castro and communism. After the action of a year ago today the OAS backed us strongly and unanimously, and indicated support for us. We also had the support of our NATO allies. When we choose again to lead we will again be leaders.

Our failure in the past 2½ years has been that we have chosen not to lead. We have chosen not to learn the lesson of the 1930's. When we begin to show leadership, when we begin to match words with deeds, then and only then will we give meaning to that noble Kennedy thought of a year ago today—"The cost of freedom is high."

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his contribution. It is interesting to note, that on this, the anniversary date of the firm action of the President, other nations in the world are celebrating it too. I have in my hand

a UPI release of this date where it is stated:

An American-owned freighter was strafed for over an hour off the Cuban coast but there were no casualties, it was reported today.

A spokesman for Universe Tank Ships, Inc., of New York, said it received a radio-gram from Captain Krause of the freighter *J. Louis* saying planes had made 16 passes over the vessel in the course of 61 minutes. Krause reported damage to the superstructure and the hull above the waterline and a fire that took 2 hours to bring under control.

The *J. Louis* is chartered to the Caribbean Steamship Co. and flies the Liberian flag. It was en route from Ocho Rios, Jamaica, to Corpus Christi, Tex., with 31,500 tons of bauxite for the Reynolds Metal Co.

According to Krause, the attack took place 12 miles off Cape Corrientes, Cuba, at 12:40 a.m. e.d.t. and lasted until 1:41 a.m.

Here is another UPI story adding to this:

In Washington, officials later said U.S. military aircraft were sent out from Key West, Fla., to investigate but when they reached the scene the offending aircraft had disappeared.

The Coast Guard also reported getting a radio message from the freighter.

The ship, built in 1961, is listed by Lloyd's Registry as a 20,253-ton vessel.

Maybe that is the anniversary present we are receiving from Castro.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. I think it is also meaningful that the Washington Daily News carried a headline today to the effect that Castro asked the United States to lift its embargo on Cuba.

I would like to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. BATTIN), in pointing out again to the American people that 1 year ago today, October 22, the President took to the airways and pointed out that the administration had "suddenly" discovered the presence of what they then described as offensive missiles on the island of Cuba. Now it appears that the administration, because of the policy they have followed during the past year, is embarrassed about this situation and would like very much to sweep it under the rug.

The gentleman from Montana is rendering a great service to this country in pointing out the history of the past year. He is also chairman of the Republican task force for investigating subversive matters in the Western Hemisphere. I would like to ask the gentleman from Montana if in his capacity as that man he has been able to determine whether an investigation was made or information is available from the administration as to whether or not any inspection of any nature have been conducted to determine if in fact all of the missiles have been removed from the island of Cuba.

Mr. BATTIN. I would have to say to the gentleman that we have no such information from the administration or any of the executive agencies, but we have had reports from clandestine sources in Cuba and from people who have recently found their way out of Cuba into this country, that there are in

fact still missiles in the country and in caves. Whether they are ready for use at this moment or not is doubtful. The fact that they are there and could be used as they were just 1 year ago today is the thing that is most frightening to me.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman would agree with me that when the President, a year ago this evening, went before nationwide television and made this revelation to the American people, the American people stood by the position he took at that time 100 percent. However, would not the gentleman agree that there has appeared to be a backing off, that our situation today does not appear to be any better in the island of Cuba; that Castro is still there, that the Russian troops are still there and in all probability many of the missiles are still there?

Mr. BATTIN. I would say to the gentleman that we have witnessed perhaps the greatest job of public relations that has ever been unleashed on the American people. We have gone from the Bay of Pigs fiasco to the Russian offensive missiles buildup in Cuba to successful subversion in Latin America. What is a very blighted part of our history is now being made by the public relations experts into a victory for the Kennedy administration. Personally I am not willing to buy what they are trying to sell and that is why I am on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

Mr. DEVINE. Of course, some newspapers have suggested that the timing of this, which was just 2 weeks before the congressional elections in 1962 may have had something to do with this revelation. So maybe there is hope that preceding the next congressional election next year, some other affirmative action may be taken by the administration that will give the American people some hope of removing communism from this hemisphere.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the gentleman's comment with regard to an anniversary present. This is reminiscent to me of the fact that Mr. Gromyko was the very man who was telling the President of the United States a year ago just a day or so before this anniversary date that there were no missiles in Cuba. This same man who should be persona non grata in the United States, after lying in his teeth to the President of the United States and to the American people, is the same man who comes back to this country a year later and sits in the White House and is welcomed with open arms, making all sorts of so-called commitments on behalf of the Russian people. I think it is interesting to note that we also had a little present there, too; at the very time the wheat deal was settled, and he was there talking to the President about it at the White House, at that very time they were holding up our troops and our goods in the corridor

going to Berlin, contrary to their specific agreements previously entered into.

It raises a question in my mind, when can you believe the Russians? When do they mean what they say? And why do we welcome Mr. Gromyko, who lied in his teeth just a year ago, and then permitted this corridor incident to occur right after the wheat deal was entered into? I ask the gentleman: Does he not agree with me on that matter?

Mr. BATTIN. I certainly do. And if the gentleman is asking me at what point I am willing to trust them I would have to say that point is not in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, I see on the front page one of the afternoon papers that Castro is asking the United States to lift the embargo. It seems that every time somebody asks us to do something, whether it is in our best interests or not, we respond.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Is not that demand being made today a repeat of the demand made on October 28 of last year, one of the five demands made by Castro, including keeping exiles from attacking Cuba from the United States and Puerto Rico?

Second, our withdrawal from Guantanamo.

Third, the very demand he is making here today, that we stop the economic quarantine or embargo to the extent to which it is effective at the present time.

Mr. BATTIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask the gentleman further with respect to this strafing incident, what happened to the policy, or I thought was the supposed policy of the United States if it happened again—in that it took over an hour for our planes to arrive after the shooting started—that we were going to use the hot-pursuit approach as suggested by the gentleman from the other body? If we had made it known that we were going to use hot pursuit, that we were not going to let this happen again, then it is possible that this additional incident would not have occurred and it is possible that additional American lives and additional ships would not be jeopardized by Castro's armed raids at the present time.

Does not the gentleman think we should let Castro know we are not going to put up with the firing by the Communist armed forces upon U.S. ships, personnel, and our allies?

Mr. BATTIN. I would say to the gentleman that his position is certainly that of mine. We misunderstood the meaning of the doctrine of hot pursuit. The way it has been applied, it means the harassment and pursuit of the Cuban exiles currently based in this country who are trying to win their island back. That is the hot pursuit they refer to, to get the Cubans back on the shores of the United States and keep them away from Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, that is the only hot pursuit we have had thus far, is it not?

Mr. BATTIN. Yes; I would say so. We do find evidence, and I have the photographs as to what happened in the Bahamas, where Castro's forces using patrol boats and helicopters prevented Cubans from leaving the control of Castro.

That is the type of incident we allow to happen, and I have no doubt that our neighbors in South and Central America wonder what the United States would do if we were confronted with more aggression within the hemisphere in violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes; letting Castro, in effect, invade British-owned property. Great Britain is one of our allies. Letting him invade those islands in order to get refugees and return them to the firing squad in Cuba, and we do not even enter a protest. We let Great Britain do it.

Mr. BATTIN. Not even the doctrine of humanitarianism that we have followed on the high seas for years was followed in this instance.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Pursuing this afternoon's story about Castro asking the United States to lift the embargo, he makes his pitch on the basis that hurricane Flora created so much devastation that the United States ought to lift its economic embargo against Cuba.

It seems to me like this might be a lesson in timing. I understand that President Kennedy is having some problems in delivering the wheat to Russia in U.S. bottoms, because the freight rate might be \$22 to \$23 a ton and foreign ships will transport it for \$12 or \$13 a ton. The President is having trouble in delivering the wheat based upon the sales which have been made thus far because there are not enough ships to go around.

Perhaps, the time is just right so that if the United States lifts the embargo on Cuba and we insist upon shipping wheat in U.S. bottoms, the freight rate will be much less to Cuba or possibly about the same from the U.S. ports to Cuba as it is from Canada to Cuba or from New Zealand, Australia, or elsewhere to Russia and back to Cuba.

So, maybe, the timing is just right to ship U.S. wheat at the world price, subsidized by the American taxpayers, in American bottom ships so that Khrushchev can meet his commitments to Dictator Castro.

This is just an observation that I make based upon looking at the news today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] for helping the United States celebrate this anniversary.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the gentleman from Montana very much for yielding.

I would like to ask a question concerning the American property that was confiscated at the time of the establishment of the Castro regime in Cuba. Has there been any discussion or negotiations with either the Cuban Government or the Russian Government in an effort to get this property back?

Mr. BATTIN. I will have to say to the gentleman from Maryland there has not been any and up until recently our own Government would not even admit they were negotiating with the Russian Government on the sale of wheat. No negotiations have taken place and there has been no public information that I know of that would indicate such a subject has ever been discussed.

Mr. MORTON. I have heard it said in very high places that more American property was confiscated by the Castro regime than in all other wars or any other acts by other foreign governments. Is that correct?

Mr. BATTIN. I do not have the figures, but I may say to the gentleman I have been informed of the same circumstances and realizing the investment we had in the private sector in Cuba, as well as the friendship of the Cuban people, we not only lost materially from the take over by Castro, but we have lost considerably the friendship of the people of that country.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the gentleman very much. I want to go on record as saying that the fact that Americans have lost literally millions of dollars worth of property as the result of revolutionary action and that our Government has not done anything as far as I can see to recover that property in value or in kind leaves me with some loss of faith as to our policy and our willingness to defend American property throughout the world.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] in calling attention to the first anniversary of an infamous episode in American history.

One year ago President Kennedy challenged aggression by Soviet Russia in Cuba. The entire Nation supported the brave words of the President little knowing that the bravery was all in the words and that within a few short days our position would be reversed.

There has never been satisfactory proof that Russian missiles were removed from Cuba. Thousands of Soviet troops are still there in defiance of our demands that they be removed. Adding to our shame, yesterday, on the eve of the first anniversary of the Cuban crisis, newspapers around the world carried the story of how American custom agents seized the boat and the equipment of freedom fighters seeking to return to Cuba to fight communism.

Mr. Speaker, the policies of the Kennedy administration have proven inef-

fective against communism everywhere in the world and especially in Cuba and Latin America. Isn't it time we adopt a policy of victory over communism instead of accommodation or more rightly, appeasement?

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in the Record of yesterday, October 21, page 18970, roll call No. 176, shows me as not having been present in the Chamber when my name was called. I was present and voted "yea" and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be changed accordingly with respect to the vote on the conference report on Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? There was no objection.

A SALUTE TO THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. HEMPHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when so many seem to have so much pleasure in criticizing, I rise to do the rather unusual; that is, to pay tribute to a Department of the Government of the United States which in its effort to carry out the legislative mandates of the Congress of the United States has done so much for the economy of the congressional district which I am privileged to represent. So I come here today to salute the Area Redevelopment Administration—because of a recent and gratifying recapitulation of the number of jobs, the resulting flourishing of the economy, the production and the other incidental benefits which we have received from the various programs, the various projects which my district has had the privilege of having instituted under the area redevelopment program.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, it has been only 2 years since this particular agency of the Government was created. I recall that my particular vote at the time in favor of it was highly criticized. I recall also that I knew at the time, and my feelings have been justified, that we could use this particular program to continue the promotion, the profit and the protection of the private enterprise system of which the American people can justly be proud, and my district has benefited greatly, and continues to do so.

This agency has performed every task given to it by the Congress of the United States with efficiency, courage, and courtesy. I salute it.

We who are in the Congress have daily contact with many of the agencies and departments of the U.S. Gov-

ernment. These contacts are necessary in order to present to the agencies prospective on the problems arising in the various congressional districts. Most of the agencies my office has contacted in the 7 years I have been in Congress have been most helpful, courteous, and I, for one, have seen very little of the bureaucracy and redtape that many want to be critical of.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, which was created by the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, has, in my district, and I am sure in hundreds of other congressional districts, performed magnificently in producing the employment and the jobs visualized by the President in asking that the Congress pass such an act. It is by far the most productive piece of legislation the Congress has passed under this administration, and has meant more to the economy of our State than any legislation passed during my tenure here of 7 years.

Not only has this administration performed nobly on its own; it has coordinated with the Community Facilities Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Small Business Administration, and others, to strengthen the economy of this Nation.

Let me begin by paying tribute to the Administrator here in Washington and his able staff. On many occasions I have telephoned or asked for a personal audience to discuss problems in my district. In every instance I was received with courtesy, efficiency, and in a climate of helpfulness. Certainly this is the kind of public service we all desire in the various agencies of our Government, Federal, State, or otherwise. The staff here in Washington is not only courteous and efficient but will use extra effort to help solve the local problem.

Most of my dealings has been with the regional office in Atlanta. The public servants I have dealt with in that office are as efficient as any businessman I have ever contacted in my 25 years of practicing law or serving in various positions with county, State, and Federal governments. I know of not one instance in which I could have anything but the highest praise for their response to our inquiry and our problems. I will not name any of them by name—suffice it to say that they have done the job they are supposed to do, and in the manner they are supposed to, and the results have been beneficial to thousands of people in the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina. But let me give you the real facts and figures that show their help.

When the Area Redevelopment Act was first passed, I asked for conferences with the officials here in Washington because I recognized quickly the potentiality of the new organization. We had a conference in my office in which various representatives quickly assured me of their ambition to be of help and followed up with their magnificent effort. At that time I only represented seven counties in the Fifth South Carolina

Congressional District, and four of those counties were classified as depressed area counties because of statistical unemployment rate, as compiled by the Employment Security Commission of South Carolina and certified by the Department of Labor of the United States. Today, I represent eight counties and five of the eight have been classified as "depressed area" counties. We needed jobs badly and as soon as we applied to the Area Redevelopment Administration for help we received help.

We initiated the program in my district by a meeting in Chesterfield, S.C., on August 12, 1961. Gathered at that meeting were representatives of various counties involved, four in my district and four in the district of my distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN L. McMILLAN. Mr. Wayne Shields was kind enough to come and give us his advice on how to proceed with applications. His discussions were good and we have all since benefited from that meeting and from what followed.

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY

Chesterfield County, S.C., had the highest unemployment rate in 1961 of any of the counties in the Fifth Congressional District. I would like to quote here the facts which caused me to know that the Area Redevelopment Act offered us great opportunity to increase employment. The South Carolina Employment Security Commission, South Carolina State Employment Service affiliated with the U.S. Employment Service:

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY

POPULATION AND LABOR FORCE

The number of inhabitants of Chesterfield County increased less than 1 percent from 1940 to 1950 but declined 7 percent from 1950 to 1960. The white population increased 3 percent. From 1950 to 1960 the white population declined 4 percent and the nonwhite 12 percent.

The total labor force increased 4 percent from 1940 to 1950. Estimates for 1960 indicate that a slight decline has occurred in the past decade.

PRINCIPAL ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES AS MEASURED BY EMPLOYMENT

Despite heavy declines in farm employment in the past two decades, agriculture continues to be the major industry. Manufacturing is the largest of the nonfarm industries, accounting for more than 40 percent of the nonfarm wage and salary workers. Manufacturing employment has not increased significantly in the past decade.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT

The county has been experiencing a high level of unemployment. The major manufacturing industries, textiles, lumber and wood products, and apparel, have contributed to unemployment from both seasonal and recessionary influence. A rough estimate placed total unemployment close to 8 percent of the total labor force in August 1961. In the midweek, approximately 11.8 percent of the workers covered by the South Carolina Unemployment Compensation Law were claiming benefits.

We now know that we have created 998 jobs, many of them permanent through ARA help in Chesterfield County, and I

would like to list here a breakdown of those jobs:

	Number employed
Jefferson:	
Building reservoir and filter plant.....	26
Building addition to bleachery 30,000 square feet.....	85
Stimulated building new homes—providing employment for additional carpenters.....	12
Providing sufficient water kept Jefferson bleachery from moving—providing employment.....	300
When reservoir and filter plant is complete the bleachery should provide employment for.....	50
Pageland:	
Construction of Pageland Manufacturing Co.....	15
Pageland Manufacturing Co., now employing.....	80
Construction of A. W. Scheffar plant..	30
A. W. Scheffar Co. employment (now).....	20
Employment of A. W. Scheffar plant when in full operation.....	65
Building and installing water tanks and sewer.....	40
Stimulated building new homes provided employment for additional carpenters.....	15
Remodeling Chesterfield Garment Corp.....	7
Chesterfield Garment Corp. will employ when complete (Negroes).....	50
Cheraw:	
Installation of water and sewer lines..	27
Pee Dee, Inc. (new plant).....	110
Chesterfield:	
Installation of water and sewer lines..	50
Stimulated building of new homes....	15
Remodeling of U.S. post office.....	12
Wildlife area, improving wildlife area for recreation.....	39
Total.....	998

These statistics alone do not reflect the genuine improvement in the whole economic picture in Chesterfield County. I was in Pageland, S.C., on Saturday, October 12, 1963, and the streets were humming with people—a wonderful picture for a community with a stimulating economy, stimulated with the help, assistance, and guidance of the Area Redevelopment Administration. For the people of Chesterfield County, I say "Thanks from the bottom of our hearts."

KERSHAW COUNTY

Recently I wrote a friend of mine in Kershaw County, the able and brilliant State senator, asking him for the impact of the ARA assistance in Kershaw County. I quote from his letter:

I hope that you will make one of your usually strong speeches about the ARA and certainly the Elgin, S.C., project is a dramatic example of what this program has done for our area. Regardless of the many criticisms which well-meaning people direct at what they term "socialistic tendencies," the ARA assistance given in our case has, in my opinion, been an outstanding example of a relatively small Government investment producing major benefits on many citizens.

It was just a year ago this month that the President announced that \$74,500 had been allocated to the town of Blaney, S.C., for assistance in constructing a waterworks system under the ARA program. You will, of course, recall that announcement and the pride we both felt in it, especially when we